SUBSCRIBE NOW... • Fast • Easy • Convenient

Search:



and have the paper tomorrow! Save up to 30% off the newsstand price





Subscribe | Vacation Hold | Automatic Renewal

Local Web

News

Sunday, March 5, 2006

Raleigh · Durham · Cary · Chapel Hill

?

Register / Log In

Letters

Home / Opinion / Letters

Go To: Keyword

Published: Mar 04, 2006 12:30 AM Modified: Mar 04, 2006 03:30 AM

Raleigh's fees are high enough as is

Regarding your Feb. 25 editorial on impact fees, don't forget Economics 101. Taxes -- and impact fees are indeed taxes -- shift the supply curve, raising prices, decreasing supply and weakening discretionary income.

Some contend that impact fees primarily affect people who haven't moved here yet. However, a significant percentage of new homes are purchased by people who already live here. These fees raise the price of existing homes as well, since existing home prices track new home prices.

Compare impact fees to our property tax rate, which has dropped considerably since 1988. It's not the rate that matters, it's the revenue. Raleigh's general fund revenues have risen at an annual rate of about 5 percent. Thoroughfare and open space fee revenues have risen 6 percent annually. As a percentage of total general revenue, these fees have risen from 1.2 percent to 1.5 percent.

Story Tools

Printer FriendlyAR Enlarge Font

More Letters

- Office expense?
- Turning organic
- Live with it
- Good for Raleigh
- Visionary rail
- Energy realities

Note: just 1.5 percent of total general revenue. Increase the fees until you completely stop new construction and you still won't have a significant percentage of total revenues.

In 1998, the city added another fee exclusively to new construction. The "nutrient charge" covers the cost of improved treatment at the wastewater plant. Including the nutrient fee, our impact fee rates have risen 50 percent, and revenue has risen 9 percent annually, nearly double the rate of the more broadly based revenues.

The consultant on impact fees was apparently brought on board to deliver the message of a forgone conclusion that fees must rise. It is the only plausible explanation for the lack of factual analysis. Their report consists of two main themes, "everybody else is doing it" and "we haven't raised the rate." Neither is sufficient justification for the increase.

Advertisements

\$1149 \$999

Notebook after mail-in rebate &

\$599 \$499

Desktop after mail-in rebate

online at Dell™ Home. Some offers end 3/8.

CLICK FOR DETAILS



Dimension™ E310 with FREE Flat Panel Upgrade The economic reality is that impact fees are outperforming our other general revenue sources, are contributing substantially more today than when originally implemented and will never be a significant percentage of our total general revenues.

If the City Council raises impact fee rates, it will be because we are unwilling or unable to control our spending. We have simply found a politically vulnerable target that will suffer a disproportional financial burden. The next time it may be a group that hits closer to home for you. The concept of taxing the other guy is terribly flawed. The consistent reality of economics is clear: the cost of governmental extractions is ultimately borne by all consumers.

What is it about the combination of low fees, low taxes and a high quality of life that some just can't seem to understand?

Tommy Craven

City Council, District A

Raleigh

(The length limit on letters was waived to permit a fuller response.)

All rights reserved. This copyrighted material may not be published, broadcast or redistributed in any manner.



TopJobs

- Medical Assistant Cary Adult Medicine
- Admissions/ Retention Counselor Wilson Technical Community College
- Construction/ Engineering Manager Aster Engineering
- Nurses/ Healthcare Professionals NC Dept. Of Prisons
- Accountant Fayetteville Building Materials Distributor
- Corporate Travel Professionals World Travel B T I

View all TopJobs







© Copyright 2006, The News & Observer Publishing Company A subsidiary of The McClatchy Company ///

Help | Contact Us | Parental Consent | Privacy | Terms of Use | RSS Feeds | N&O Store



newsobserver.com Letters	
http://www.nauvahaamar.aom/590/stan/A12970.html /2 of 2)2/6/2006 2:10:01 AM	